# Alienation AC - Normal:

### Part 1 is Volition:

[omitted]

### Part 2 is Appropriation:

[omitted]

### Part 3 is Handguns:

#### I advocate that the maxim of banning private handgun ownership in the United States and all relevant territories ought to be adopted generally. I defend the intent of banning handguns, so consequences are irrelevant, but I will accept reasonable neg preferences on specificity and implementation as long as I don’t abandon my maxim.

#### The aff thesis is that the support for “private ownership” of handguns is based on an illegitimate coercion of labor, and because of that the support of handguns is alienating. A handgun ban is key to rectifying conditions of alienation that exist due to private property and forced labor.

#### If private property as a general category is alienating then any particular instance of that category is also alienating. Even if rejecting one specific form of private property doesn’t get rid of the whole problem, we should still reject it. For example, if someone calls me out for being a sexist, the reply that I shouldn’t stop being sexist because it wouldn’t stop all of sexism is ridiculous because each rejection leads to the rejection of the problem.

#### Any motivation toward opposing gun control is based in a right to property, but absolute property rights are inconsistent with the pursuit of any moral values as they render a maxim incoherent, which causes alienation. JULIUS:

Julius, A.J. “Independent People In Kisilevsky And Stone”. (Eds.). *Freedom And Force: Essays On Kant’s Legal Philosophy,* Forthcoming.

Whatever its force against usufruct this argument from independence is no reason to settle for property. Property draws the same objection. Suppose that I can come to own a thing by claiming or receiving a title to it that I enjoy independently of any actual or planned use of the thing. Suppose that I don’t in this way own any mushrooms and that I can’t grow [any] mushrooms using only what’s mine. It may be that I can now take up the purpose of making a mushroom omelette. I can [only make an omelet] do that if I see the task as falling in my power. The task is in my power if I have some way of inducing the inputs’ current owners to hand them over to me. Or if I can grab the ingredients and cook them up before anyone grabs them back. But of course I lack any right against others that they fall in with this plan. No one wrongs me, under property, by declining to pass me the mushrooms she owns. A mushroom owner is in her rights to hide or lock her stuff away, to drive me off when I try to use it, to recover it by force if I succeed briefly in taking it over. She is entitled to do what hinders my use of the mushrooms. But I can set the omelette as an end only if she won’t hinder my use of the mushrooms. So I who own no mushrooms lack an entitlement against others that I set myself the end of a mushroom omelette. In the supermarket aisles of our actual property society you will presumably encounter persons who have set particular suppers as their ends although they do not yet own the ingredients. “Why you are putting those mushrooms in that cart?” “I’m making a mushroom omelette tonight.” A shopper like this has managed to set out after her gastronomic end because she could see it as falling within her power. She was thinking that an offer of cash for the ingredients would move the grocer to give them up. When a shopper purchases the ingredients, the onetime owners relinquish their rights to interfere with her cooking. She finally enjoys against them a right that they not withhold the means to her purpose. She has the makings not only of an omelette but of the right to set herself the omelette-making end. But again that right has come too late. If the means were bought for the sake of the end, the end was set before she had a right against others to set it. Perhaps the new owner of the ingredients enjoys a right to affirm the end she’s already pursuing and to carry on with it. But if this is true it’s true thanks to the accommodating particular choices of farmers and merchants. She owes her achievement of her right to do what she was already doing to the forbearance of persons who, after she’d set the end but before she’d bought the means, were entitled to act in ways that would have shut her project down. A[n] typical putative end-affirming right in the property society bears a strong resemblance to the would-be end-affirming right that’s characteristic of usufruct. The right takes hold only once I’ve bought the things my purposes demand, and so it typically follows and depends on rather than preceding or protecting my initial pursuit of the purpose. And I only ever achieve the right if and because the others choose to part with their goods despite their entitlements to hold on to them. If like me and perhaps like Ripstein you think **th**at a right to set ends has got to come[s] first and that it’s necessarily invulnerable to other persons’ particular choices, then like me you should worry that property puts such independence out of reach. Independence will

#### And, private property has historically been a tool to alienate and oppress the proletariat in order to increase the capital of the bourgeoisie. HIDALGO:

Ownership and private property from the perspectives of Hegel and Marx. By: Desiree Hidalgo The Agora: Political Science Undergraduate Journal Vol.3 No.2 (2013)

As it can be seen, private property is of main concern to Marx since it is causing alienation of the majority and the generation of capital for a minority, and thus these are two connected issues. Marx uses the term alienation to describe how laborers are neglected of the development of their human faculties by being reduced to sell their labor in order to survive, as he says that the laborer becomes a “cheaper commodity the more he produces”19. Marx says of capitalism that it has, “centralised means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands”20. If for Hegel private property causes freedom, private property for Marx causes alienation to freedom of the proletariat. Laborers as a cause aim for the “abolition of private property”21. Marx analyzes four ways in which the proletariats are affected by the private property of the bourgeoisie. He suggests that communists are attempting to change the mode of production in the given circumstances that world events occur, and he criticizes Hegelians for doing the contrary, as he claims, “in no way are they attacking the actual existing world; they merely attack the phrases of this world”22. Marx attempts to explain the material production that is facilitated by private property. He argues that proletarians have been used as a commodity in order to increase the capital of the bourgeoisie. In this way by using laborers as commodities, the bourgeoisie has divided labor, where the proletarians are working for the bourgeoisie as Marx puts it, “they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine, by the overlooked, and above all, by the individual bourgeoisie manufacturer himself”24. The division of labour has different effects on the workers, but the essence of private property is impeding individuals to be free as they would be in other circumstances. Marx uses present situations to demonstrate why the abolition of private property would free the majority. According to Marx “the increase in value of the world of things is directly proportional to the decrease in value of the human world”25.

#### A ban on handguns is part of a broader strategy that deconstructs private property, as it exists in the status quo, which currently alienates workers.

#### Through labor, one becomes alien to the rest of the world since your life becomes meaningless once you orient yourself towards private property. Setting up a system of property like that in the neg world entails that individuals are separated from their projects by the property they have. MARX 44:

Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844. Karl Marx “Estranged Labour”

All these consequences are implied in the statement that the worker is related to the product of labor as to an alien object. For on this premise it is clear that the more the worker spends himself, the more powerful becomes the alien world of objects which he [the agent] creates over and against himself, the poorer he himself – his inner world – becomes, the less belongs to him as his own. It is the same in religion. The more man puts into God, the less he retains in himself. The worker puts his life into the object; but now his [their] life no longer belongs to [the worker] him but to the object. Hence, the greater this activity, the more the worker lacks objects. Whatever the product of his labor is, he is not. Therefore, the greater this product, the less is he himself. The alienation of the worker in his [their] product means not only that his [their] labor becomes an object, an external existence, but that it exists outside [them] him, independently, as something alien to [them] him, and that it becomes a power on its own confronting him. It means that the life which he has conferred on the object confronts him as something hostile and alien. ||XXIII/ Let us now look more closely at the objectification, at the production of the worker; and in it at the estrangement, the loss of the object, of his product. The worker can create nothing without nature, without the sensuous external world. It is the material on which his labor is realized, in which it is active, from which, and by means of which it produces. But just as nature provides labor with [the] means of life in the sense that labor cannot live without objects on which to operate, on the other hand, it also provides the means of life in the more restricted sense, i.e., the means for the physical subsistence of the worker himself. Thus the more the worker by his labor appropriates the external world, sensuous nature, the more he deprives himself [themselves] of the means of life in two respects: first, in that the sensuous external world more and more ceases to be an object belonging to his labor – to be his labor’s means of life; and, second, in that it more and more ceases to be a means of life in the immediate sense, means for the physical subsistence of the worker. In both respects, therefore, the worker becomes a servant of his object, first, in that he receives an object of labor, i.e., in that he receives work, and, secondly, in that he receives means of subsistence. This enables him to exist, first as a worker; and second, as a physical subject. The height of this servitude is that it is only as a worker that he can maintain himself as a physical subject and that it is only as a physical subject that he is a worker. (According to the economic laws the estrangement of the worker in his object is expressed thus: the more the worker produces, the less he has to consume; the more values he creates, the more valueless, the more unworthy he becomes; the better formed his product, the more deformed becomes the worker; the more civilized his object, the more barbarous becomes the worker; the more powerful labor becomes, the more powerless becomes the worker; the more ingenious labor becomes, the less ingenious becomes the worker and the more he becomes nature’s slave.) Political economy conceals the estrangement inherent in the nature of labor by not considering the direct relationship between the worker (labor) and production. It is true that labor produces for the rich wonderful things – but for the worker it produces privation. It produces palaces – but for the worker, hovels. It produces beauty – but for the worker, deformity. It replaces labor by machines, but it throws one section of the workers back into barbarous types of labor and it turns the other section into a machine. It produces intelligence – but for the worker, stupidity, cretinism. The direct relationship of labor to its products is the relationship of the worker to the objects of his production. The relationship of the man of means to the objects of production and to production itself is only a consequence of this first relationship – and confirms it. We shall consider this other aspect later. When we ask, then, what is the essential relationship of labor we are asking about the relationship of the worker to production. Till now we have been considering the estrangement, the alienation of the worker only in one of its aspects , i.e., the worker’s relationship to the products of his labor. But the estrangement is manifested not only in the result but in the act of production, within the producing activity, itself. How could the worker come to face the product of his activity as a stranger, were it not that in the very act of production he was estranging himself from himself? The product is after all but the summary of the activity, of production. If then the product of labor is alienation, production itself must be active alienation, the alienation of activity, the activity of alienation. In the estrangement of the object of labor is merely summarized the estrangement, the alienation, in the activity of labor itself.

#### Outweighs:

#### a) even if an agent can participate underneath your ethical system – their life is meaningless. Ethics has to be a guide to action that leads to positive ends but property is definitionally antithetical to that as per the Marx evidence

#### b) destroys any possibility of agency – once one orients themselves toward private property they become alien to themselves so there is no way to prescribe obligations to them underneath the neg framework

#### What distinguishes animals for humans is consciousness, the process of divorcing thought from arbitrary principles – but alienated labor reduces us to animal instincts – I control the root cause to forms of oppression since this specific form of alienation is the basis of all exclusion, social and mental.

Karl Marx 2 “Estranged Labour”Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844

Physically man lives only on these products of nature, whether they appear in the form of food, heating, clothes, a dwelling, etc. The universality of man appears in practice precisely in the universality which makes all nature his inorganic body – both inasmuch as nature is (1) his direct means of life, and (2) the material, the object, and the instrument of his life activity. Nature is man’s inorganic body – nature, that is, insofar as it is not itself human body. Man lives on nature – means that nature is his body, with which he must remain in continuous interchange if he is not to die. That man’s physical and spiritual life is linked to nature means simply that nature is linked to itself, for man is a part of nature. In estranging from man (1) nature, and (2) himself, his own active functions, his life activity, estranged labor estranges the species from man. It changes for him the life of the species into a means of individual life. First it [alienated labor] estranges the life of the species and individual life, and secondly it makes individual life in its abstract form the purpose of the life of the species, likewise in its abstract and estranged form. For labor, life activity, productive life itself, appears to man in the first place merely as a means of satisfying a need – the need to maintain physical existence. Yet the productive life is the life of the species. It is life-engendering life. The whole character of a species, its species-character, is contained in the character of its life activity; and free, conscious activity is man’s species-character. Life itself appears only as a means to life. The animal is immediately one with its life activity. It does not distinguish itself from it. It is its life activity. Man makes his life activity [with] itself the object of his will and of his consciousness. He has conscious life activity. It is not a determination with which he directly merges. Conscious life activity distinguishes man immediately from animal life activity. It is just because of this that he is a species-being. Or it is only because he is a species-being that he is a conscious being, i.e., that his own life is an object for him. Only because of that is his activity free activity. Estranged labor reverses the relationship, so that it is just because man is a conscious being that he makes his life activity, his essential being, a mere means to his existence. In creating a world of objects by his personal activity, in his work upon inorganic nature, man proves himself a conscious species-being, i.e., as a being that treats the species as his own essential being, or that treats itself as a species-being. Admittedly animals also produce. They build themselves nests, dwellings, like the bees, beavers, ants, etc. But an animal only produces what it immediately needs for itself or its young. It produces one-sidedly, whilst man produces universally. It produces only under the dominion of immediate physical need, whilst man produces even when he is free from physical need and only truly produces in freedom therefrom. An animal produces only itself, whilst man reproduces the whole of nature. An animal’s product belongs immediately to its physical body, whilst man freely confronts his product. An animal forms only in accordance with the standard and the need of the species to which it belongs, whilst man knows how to produce in accordance with the standard of every species, and knows how to apply everywhere the inherent standard to the object. Man therefore also forms objects in accordance with the laws of beauty. It is just in his work upon the objective world, therefore, that man really proves himself to be a species-being. This production is his active species-life. Through this production, nature appears as his work and his reality. The object of labor is, therefore, the objectification of man’s species-life: for he duplicates himself not only, as in consciousness, intellectually, but also actively, in reality, and therefore he sees himself in a world that he has created. In tearing away from man the object of his production, therefore, estranged labor tears from him his species-life, his real objectivity as a member of the species and transforms his advantage over animals into the disadvantage that his inorganic body, nature, is taken from him. Similarly, in degrading spontaneous, free activity to a means, estranged labor makes man’s species-life a means to his physical existence. The consciousness which man has of his species is thus transformed by estrangement in such a way that species[-life] becomes for him a means. Estranged labor turns thus: (3) Man’s species-being, both nature and his spiritual species-property, into a being alien to him, into a means of his individual existence. It estranges from man his own body, as well as external nature and his spiritual aspect, his human aspect. (4) An immediate consequence of the fact that man is estranged from the product of his labor, from his life activity, from his species-being, is the estrangement of man from man. When man confronts himself, he confronts the other man. What applies to a man’s relation to his work, to the product of his labor and to himself, also holds of a man’s relation to the other man, and to the other man’s labor and object of labor. In fact, the proposition that man’s species-nature is estranged from him means that one man is estranged from the other, as each of them is from man’s essential nature. The estrangement of man, and in fact every relationship in which man [stands] to himself, is realized and expressed only in the relationship in which a man stands to other men. Hence within the relationship of estranged labor each man views the other in accordance with the standard and the relationship in which he finds himself as a worker. ||XXV| We took our departure from a fact of political economy – the estrangement of the worker and his production. We have formulated this fact in conceptual terms as estranged, alienated labor. We have analyzed this concept – hence analyzing merely a fact of political economy. Let us now see, further, how the concept of estranged, alienated labor must express and present itself in real life. If the product of labor is alien to me, if it confronts me as an alien power, to whom, then, does it belong? To a being other than myself. Who is this being? The gods? To be sure, in the earliest times the principal production (for example, the building of temples, etc., in Egypt, India and Mexico) appears to be in the service of the gods, and the product belongs to the gods. However, the gods on their own were never the lords of labor. No more was nature. And what a contradiction it would be if, the more man subjugated nature by his labor and the more the miracles of the gods were rendered superfluous by the miracles of industry, the more man were to renounce the joy of production and the enjoyment of the product to please these powers. The alien being, to whom labor and the product of labor belongs, in whose service labor is done and for whose benefit the product of labor is provided, can only be man himself. If the product of labor does not belong to the worker, if it confronts him as an alien power, then this can only be because it belongs to some other man than the worker. If the worker’s activity is a torment to him, to another it must give satisfaction and pleasure. Not the gods, not nature, but only man himself can be this alien power over man. We must bear in mind the previous proposition that man’s relation to himself becomes for him objective and actual through his relation to the other man. Thus, if the product of his labor, his labor objectified, is for him an alien, hostile, powerful object independent of him, then his position towards it is such that someone else is master of this object, someone who is alien, hostile, powerful, and independent of him. If he treats his own activity as an unfree activity, then he treats it as an activity performed in the service, under the dominion, the coercion, and the yoke of another man. Every self-estrangement of man, from himself and from nature, appears in the relation in which he places himself and nature to men other than and differentiated from himself. For this reason religious self-estrangement necessarily appears in the relationship of the layman to the priest, or again to a mediator, etc., since we are here dealing with the intellectual world. In the real practical world self-estrangement can only become manifest through the real practical relationship to other men. The medium through which estrangement takes place is itself practical. Thus through estranged labor man not only creates his relationship to the object and to the act of production as to powers [in the manuscript Menschen (men) instead of Mächte (powers). – Ed.] that are alien and hostile to him; he also creates the relationship in which other men stand to his production and to his product, and the relationship in which he stands to these other men. Just as he creates his own production as the loss of his reality, as his punishment; his own product as a loss, as a product not belonging to him; so he creates the domination of the person who does not produce over production and over the product. Just as he estranges his own activity from himself, so he confers upon the stranger an activity which is not his own. We have until now considered this relationship only from the standpoint of the worker and later on we shall be considering it also from the standpoint of the non-worker. Through estranged, alienated labor, then, the worker produces the relationship to this labor of a man alien to labor and standing outside it. The relationship of the worker to labor creates the relation to it of the capitalist (or whatever one chooses to call the master of labor). Private property is thus the product, the result, the necessary consequence, of alienated labor, of the external relation of the worker to nature and to himself. Private property thus results by analysis from the concept of alienated labor, i.e., of alienated man, of estranged labor, of estranged life, of estranged man. True, it is as a result of the movement of private property that we have obtained the concept of alienated labor (of alienated life) in political economy. But on analysis of this concept it becomes clear that though private property appears to be the reason, the cause of alienated labor, it is rather its consequence, just as the gods are originally not the cause but the effect of man’s intellectual confusion. Later this relationship becomes reciprocal.

#### This outweighs:

#### a) uncertainty on the framework debate means you prefer this impact since consciousness is the foundation of all ethical theories since ethics themselves would have no way to guide action if agents didn’t have the possibility to participate in them.

#### b) solvency – having everything around one non-alienated doesn’t solve alienation, but rather, one must be able to identify with the alien events that happen around the self. You can be denied certain ends, but you can’t be denied the ability to pursue ends at all.

Rahel Jaeggi 6 (August 2014). “Alienation.” Columbia University Press. Translated by Frederick Neuhouser and Alan E. Smith. Edited by Frederick Neuhouser. Rahel Jaeggi is professor of social and political philosophy at the Humboldt University in Berlin. Her research focuses on ethics, social philosophy, political philosophy, philosophical anthropology, social ontology, and critical theory.

There must be, then, a distinction between alienating and nonalienating situations where one has lost control or where the results of our actions take on an independent existence in relation to us. This distinction can be located [on whether], on the one hand, in one’s later attitude to the events in question: one can reject or accept them; one can identify (or not) after the fact with events that had a dynamic of their own. On the other hand, we can also locate the distinction in different ways of participating in events that have taken on an independent existence. The idea of a self’s being “present” (or “present to itself”) at least hints at the relevant point here: there can be degrees of identification with events for which the self is not entirely responsible that depend not on the amount of control one has over them but on the greater or lesser extent to which one is present in them.22 (One is then “taken in” by the situation, absorbed in it; one forgets oneself in it, in contrast to the distance that characterizes the young man of our example.) According to this analysis, then, not every case in which the results of actions have taken on an independent existence and not every uncontrollable dynamic of life events is alienating per se. We have seen that the question of whether a life takes on an independent existence in an alienating manner is not decided by whether it is in every respect self-structured, controlled, or predictable but rather on whether the part of it that is outside one’s command can be appropriated in a certain way. The theme of appropriation here (as set out in chapter 1) is supposed to bring out the point that having something at one’s command, “putting oneself in relation to something,” or being able to identify with something does not depend on understanding that something as—in Marx’s sense—the product of one’s own activity. Rather, it is a question of whether or not one can appropriate the events that determine our lives, especially when they are not steered or controlled by us, where they are not “placed into the world” by us. The process of externalization and reappropriation at issue here is perhaps best thought of as a process of “balancing out”: every decision, every action sets processes in motion or produces results that may at first be alien and can be made our own only by (re)appropriating them. What is one’s own, then, is not necessarily something one has produced or directed oneself; the result of an act of appropriation does not consist only of something that was previously one’s own. Having an appropriating relation to the (uncontrollable) events of one’s own life means that one must be able to bring oneself into an affirmative relation to what is alien or uncontrollable. Alienation is not the foreignness (or the becoming foreign) per se of the results of actions but rather an interruption or disturbance of the process in which actions produce (uncontrollable) results to which one then establishes a relation of reappropriation. The concept of appropriation is well-suited for illustrating the practical character of this process. Appropriation is not a matter of making a choice from a disengaged or objective standpoint, nor is it a matter of merely rejecting or agreeing to the result of an action. What I have called balancing out does not depend on weighing things from an external perspective; it is a process in which one is involved. The process of appropriation is not made up only of cognitive elements, and it is not subject only to the will. Not every- thing one might like to be can actually be made one’s own. Appropriation is a process of learning and experience in which the relation between freedom and uncontrollability is negotiated. Conversely, alienation is a halting of this process.

#### Private property is an instance where appropriation goes too far – appropriation is a process of relating to the world to oneself but appropriating property to be private cannot be exclusively one’s own – once something becomes private that causes alienation.

Rahel Jaeggi 7 (August 2014). “Alienation.” Columbia University Press. Translated by Frederick Neuhouser and Alan E. Smith. Edited by Frederick Neuhouser. Rahel Jaeggi is professor of social and political philosophy at the Humboldt University in Berlin. Her research focuses on ethics, social philosophy, political philosophy, philosophical anthropology, social ontology, and critical theory.

What does it mean to appropriate something? 12 If the concept of appropriation refers to a specific relation between self and world, between individuals and objects (whether spiritual or material), what precisely does this relation look like, what are its particular character and its specific structure? Various aspects come together here, and together they account for the concept’s appeal and potential. As opposed to the mere learning of certain contents, talk of appropriation emphasizes that something is not merely passively taken up but actively worked through and independently assimilated. In contrast to merely theoretical insight into some issue, appropriation—comparable to the psycho- analytic process of “working through”—means that one can “deal with” what one knows, that it stands at one’s disposal as knowledge and that one really and practically has command over it. And appropriating a role means more than being able to fill it: one is, we could say, identified with it. Something that we appropriate **does not remain external to ourselves.** In making something our own, it becomes a part of ourselves in a certain respect.This suggests a kind of introjection and a mixing of oneself with the objects of appropriation. It also evokes the idea of productively and formatively interacting with what one makes one’s own. Appropriation does not leave what is appropriated unchanged. This is why the appropriation of public spaces, for example, means more than that one uses them. We make them our own by making a mark on them through what we do in and with them, by transforming them through appropriative use such that they first acquire a specific form through this use (though not necessarily in a material sense). Although it has one of its roots in an account of property relations, the concept of appropriation, in contrast to mere possession, emphasizes the particular quality of a process that first constitutes a real act of taking possession of something. Accordingly, appropriation is a particular mode of seizing possession.13 Someone who appropriates something puts her individual mark on it, inserts her own ends and qualities into it. This means that sometimes we must still make something that we already possess our own. Relations of appropriation, then, are characterized by several features: appropriation is a form of praxis, a way of relating practically to the world. It refers to a relation of penetration, assimilation, and internalization in which what is appropriated is at the same time altered, structured, and formed. The crucial point of this model (also of great importance for Marx) is a conse- quence of this structure of penetration and assimilation: appropriation always means a transformation of both poles of the relation. In a process of appropriation both what is appropriated and the appropriator are transformed. In the process of incorporation (appropriative assimilation) the incorporator does not remain the same. This point can be given a constructivist turn: what is appropriated is itself constituted in the process of appropriation; by the same token, what is appropriated does not exist in the absence of appropriation. (In some cases this is obvious: there is no public space as such without its being publicly appropriated; but even social roles exist only insofar as they are constantly reappropriated.) One now sees the potential and the peculiar character of the concept: the possibility of appropriating something refers, on the one hand, to a subject’s power to act and form and to impose its own meaningful mark on the world it appropriates. (A successful appropriation of social roles or activities and, by extension, the appropriating relation one can take to one’s life in general constitute something like self-determination and being the author of one’s own life.) On the other hand, a process of appropriation is always bound to a given, previously existing content and thereby also to an independent meaning and dynamic over which one does not have complete command. (Thus a role, for example, in order to be appropriated, must always be “found” as an already existing model and complex of rules; it can be reinterpreted but not invented from scratch. Skills that we appropriate are constrained by success conditions; leading our own life depends on circumstances over which we do not have complete command.) There is, then, an interesting tension in the idea of appropriation between what is previously given and what is form- able, between taking over and creating, between the subject’s sovereignty and its dependence. The crucial relation here is that between something’s being alien and its accessibility**:** objects of appropriation are neither exclusively alien nor exclusively one’s own. As Michael Theunissen puts it, “I do not need to appropriate what is exclusively my own, and what is exclusively alien I am unable to appropriate.”14 In contrast to Marx, then, for whom appropriation is conceived of according to a model of reappropriation, the account of the dynamic of appropriation and alienation that I am proposing reconceives the very concept of appropriation. This involves rehabilitating what is alien **in the model of appropriation** and radicalizing that model in the direction of a nonessentialist conception of appropriation. Appropriation would then be a permanent process of transformation in which what is appropriated first comes to be through its appropriation, without one needing to fall back into the myth of a creatio ex nihilo. Understanding appropriation as a relation in which we are simultaneously bound to something and separated from it, and in which what is appropriated always remains both alien and our own, has important implications for the ideas of emancipation and alienation bound up with the concept of appropriation. The aspiration of a successful appropriation of self and world would be, then, to make the world one’s own without it having been already one’s own and in wanting to give structure to the world and to one’s own life without beginning from a position of already having complete command over them.

# Alienation AC - Critical:

## Part 1 is Volition:

[omitted]

## Part 2 is Appropriation:

[omitted]

## Part 3 is Handguns:

### Advocacy:

#### I advocate that the maxim of banning private handgun ownership in the United States and all relevant territories ought to be adopted generally. I defend the intent of banning handguns, so consequences are irrelevant, but I will accept reasonable neg preferences on specificity and implementation as long as I don’t abandon my maxim.

#### The aff thesis is that the support for “private ownership” of handguns is based on an illegitimate coercion of labor, and because of that the support of handguns is alienating. A handgun ban is key to rectifying conditions of alienation that exist due to private property and forced labor.

#### If private property as a general category is alienating then any particular instance of that category is also alienating. Even if rejecting one specific form of private property doesn’t get rid of the whole problem, we should still reject it. For example, if someone calls me out for being a sexist, the reply that I shouldn’t stop being sexist because it wouldn’t stop all of sexism is ridiculous because each rejection leads to the rejection of the problem.

### Contention 1 is Property Rights:

#### Absolute property rights are oppressive – they entail the logic of selfishness that prevents the possibility of communal engagement. Absolute property rights are inconsistent with the pursuit of any moral values as they render end setting impossible since no agent cares about another’s ends. JULIUS:

Julius, A.J. “Independent People In Kisilevsky And Stone”. (Eds.). *Freedom And Force: Essays On Kant’s Legal Philosophy,* Forthcoming.

Whatever its force against usufruct this argument from independence is no reason to settle for property. Property draws the same objection. Suppose that I can come to own a thing by claiming or receiving a title to it that I enjoy independently of any actual or planned use of the thing. Suppose that I don’t in this way own any mushrooms and that I can’t grow [any] mushrooms using only what’s mine. It may be that I can now take up the purpose of making a mushroom omelette. I can [only make an omelette] do that if I see the task as falling in my power. The task is in my power if I have some way of inducing the inputs’ current owners to hand them over to me. Or if I can grab the ingredients and cook them up before anyone grabs them back. But of course I lack any right against others that they fall in with this plan. No one wrongs me, under property, by declining to pass me the mushrooms she owns. A mushroom owner is in her rights to hide or lock her stuff away, to drive me off when I try to use it, to recover it by force if I succeed briefly in taking it over. She is entitled to do what hinders my use of the mushrooms. But I can set the omelette as an end only if she won’t hinder my use of the mushrooms. So I who own no mushrooms lack an entitlement against others that I set myself the end of a mushroom omelette. In the supermarket aisles of our actual property society you will presumably encounter persons who have set particular suppers as their ends although they do not yet own the ingredients. “Why you are putting those mushrooms in that cart?” “I’m making a mushroom omelette tonight.” A shopper like this has managed to set out after her gastronomic end because she could see it as falling within her power. She was thinking that an offer of cash for the ingredients would move the grocer to give them up. When a shopper purchases the ingredients, the onetime owners relinquish their rights to interfere with her cooking. She finally enjoys against them a right that they not withhold the means to her purpose. She has the makings not only of an omelette but of the right to set herself the omelette-making end. But again that right has come too late. If the means were bought for the sake of the end, the end was set before she had a right against others to set it. Perhaps the new owner of the ingredients enjoys a right to affirm the end she’s already pursuing and to carry on with it. But if this is true it’s true thanks to the accommodating particular choices of farmers and merchants. She owes her achievement of her right to do what she was already doing to the forbearance of persons who, after she’d set the end but before she’d bought the means, were entitled to act in ways that would have shut her project down. A[n] typical putative end-affirming right in the property society bears a strong resemblance to the would-be end-affirming right that’s characteristic of usufruct. The right takes hold only once I’ve bought the things my purposes demand, and so it typically follows and depends on rather than preceding or protecting my initial pursuit of the purpose. And I only ever achieve the right if and because the others choose to part with their goods despite their entitlements to hold on to them. If like me and perhaps like Ripstein you think **th**at a right to set ends has got to come[s] first and that it’s necessarily invulnerable to other persons’ particular choices, then like me you should worry that property puts such independence out of reach. Independence will

#### And, private property has historically been a tool to alienate and oppress the proletariat in order to increase the capital of the bourgeoisie. HIDALGO:

Ownership and private property from the perspectives of Hegel and Marx. By: Desiree Hidalgo The Agora: Political Science Undergraduate Journal Vol.3 No.2 (2013)

As it can be seen, private property is of main concern to Marx since it is causing alienation of the majority and the generation of capital for a minority, and thus these are two connected issues. Marx uses the term alienation to describe how laborers are neglected of the development of their human faculties by being reduced to sell their labor in order to survive, as he says that the laborer becomes a “cheaper commodity the more he produces”19. Marx says of capitalism that it has, “centralised means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands”20. If for Hegel private property causes freedom, private property for Marx causes alienation to freedom of the proletariat. Laborers as a cause aim for the “abolition of private property”21. Marx analyzes four ways in which the proletariats are affected by the private property of the bourgeoisie. He suggests that communists are attempting to change the mode of production in the given circumstances that world events occur, and he criticizes Hegelians for doing the contrary, as he claims, “in no way are they attacking the actual existing world; they merely attack the phrases of this world”22. Marx attempts to explain the material production that is facilitated by private property. He argues that proletarians have been used as a commodity in order to increase the capital of the bourgeoisie. In this way by using laborers as commodities, the bourgeoisie has divided labor, where the proletarians are working for the bourgeoisie as Marx puts it, “they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine, by the overlooked, and above all, by the individual bourgeoisie manufacturer himself”24. The division of labour has different effects on the workers, but the essence of private property is impeding individuals to be free as they would be in other circumstances. Marx uses present situations to demonstrate why the abolition of private property would free the majority. According to Marx “the increase in value of the world of things is directly proportional to the decrease in value of the human world”25.

#### Outweighs:

#### a) probability – this cycle of oppression has existed from centuries and since the foundation of the state. Once one is in the system, one is continually oppressed since you work for the bourgeoisie.

#### b) magnitude – once someone is put in a system of forced labor, they are structurally precluded from engaging in other activities since they are forced by the wealthy to work

#### c) root cause - the construction of private labor creates a social system of alienation – I control the root cause since private property creates a system that controls your entire life.

Rahel Jaeggi 5 (August 2014). “Alienation.” Columbia University Press. Translated by Frederick Neuhouser and Alan E. Smith. Edited by Frederick Neuhouser. Rahel Jaeggi is professor of social and political philosophy at the Humboldt University in Berlin. Her research focuses on ethics, social philosophy, political philosophy, philosophical anthropology, social ontology, and critical theory.

Second, if alienation is a form of powerlessness and impotence, then the theory of alienation concerns itself with both more and something other than straightforward relations of domination. What we are alienated from is always at once alien and our own. In alienated relations we appear to be, in a compli- cated manner, both victims and perpetrators. Someone who becomes alien- ated in or through a role at the same time plays this role herself; someone who is led by alien desires at the same time has those desires—and we would fail to recognize the complexity of the situation if we were to speak here simply of internalized compulsion or psychological manipulation. Social institutions that confront us as rigid and alien are at the same time created by us. In such a case we are not—and this is what is specific to the diagnosis of alienation— master over what we (collectively) do. As Erich Fromm vividly puts it: [The bourgeois human being] produces a world of the greatest and most wonderful things; but these, his own creations, confront him as alien and threatening; although they have been created, he no longer feels himself to be their master but their servant. The whole material world becomes the monstrosity of a giant machine that prescribes the direction and tempo of his life. The work of his hands, intended to serve him and make him happy, becomes a world he is alienated from, a world he humbly and impotently obeys.1 In relations of alienation the feeling of impotence does not necessarily imply the existence of an actual power—an agent—that creates a condition of impotence. Typically the theory of alienation—whether in the form of Hei- degger’s “They” or Marx’s analysis of capitalism—concerns itself with subtle forms of structural heteronomy or with the anonymous, dominating character of objectified relationships that appear to take on a life of their own over and against individual agents. Formulated differently, the concept of alienation posits a connection between indifference and domination that calls for inter- pretation. The things, situations, facts, to which we have no relation when alienated do not seem indifferent to us without consequence.

#### Private property is an instance where appropriation goes too far – appropriation is a process of relating to the world to oneself but appropriating property to be private cannot be exclusively one’s own.

Rahel Jaeggi 6 (August 2014). “Alienation.” Columbia University Press. Translated by Frederick Neuhouser and Alan E. Smith. Edited by Frederick Neuhouser. Rahel Jaeggi is professor of social and political philosophy at the Humboldt University in Berlin. Her research focuses on ethics, social philosophy, political philosophy, philosophical anthropology, social ontology, and critical theory.

What does it mean to appropriate something? 12 If the concept of appropriation refers to a specific relation between self and world, between individuals and objects (whether spiritual or material), what precisely does this relation look like, what are its particular character and its specific structure? Various aspects come together here, and together they account for the concept’s appeal and potential. As opposed to the mere learning of certain contents, talk of appropriation emphasizes that something is not merely passively taken up but actively worked through and independently assimilated. In contrast to merely theoretical insight into some issue, appropriation—comparable to the psycho- analytic process of “working through”—means that one can “deal with” what one knows, that it stands at one’s disposal as knowledge and that one really and practically has command over it. And appropriating a role means more than being able to fill it: one is, we could say, identified with it. Something that we appropriate **does not remain external to ourselves.** In making something our own, it becomes a part of ourselves in a certain respect.This suggests a kind of introjection and a mixing of oneself with the objects of appropriation. It also evokes the idea of productively and formatively interacting with what one makes one’s own. Appropriation does not leave what is appropriated unchanged. This is why the appropriation of public spaces, for example, means more than that one uses them. We make them our own by making a mark on them through what we do in and with them, by transforming them through appropriative use such that they first acquire a specific form through this use (though not necessarily in a material sense). Although it has one of its roots in an account of property relations, the concept of appropriation, in contrast to mere possession, emphasizes the particular quality of a process that first constitutes a real act of taking possession of something. Accordingly, appropriation is a particular mode of seizing possession.13 Someone who appropriates something puts her individual mark on it, inserts her own ends and qualities into it. This means that sometimes we must still make something that we already possess our own. Relations of appropriation, then, are characterized by several features: appropriation is a form of praxis, a way of relating practically to the world. It refers to a relation of penetration, assimilation, and internalization in which what is appropriated is at the same time altered, structured, and formed. The crucial point of this model (also of great importance for Marx) is a conse- quence of this structure of penetration and assimilation: appropriation always means a transformation of both poles of the relation. In a process of appropriation both what is appropriated and the appropriator are transformed. In the process of incorporation (appropriative assimilation) the incorporator does not remain the same. This point can be given a constructivist turn: what is appropriated is itself constituted in the process of appropriation; by the same token, what is appropriated does not exist in the absence of appropriation. (In some cases this is obvious: there is no public space as such without its being publicly appropriated; but even social roles exist only insofar as they are constantly reappropriated.) One now sees the potential and the peculiar character of the concept: the possibility of appropriating something refers, on the one hand, to a subject’s power to act and form and to impose its own meaningful mark on the world it appropriates. (A successful appropriation of social roles or activities and, by extension, the appropriating relation one can take to one’s life in general constitute something like self-determination and being the author of one’s own life.) On the other hand, a process of appropriation is always bound to a given, previously existing content and thereby also to an independent meaning and dynamic over which one does not have complete command. (Thus a role, for example, in order to be appropriated, must always be “found” as an already existing model and complex of rules; it can be reinterpreted but not invented from scratch. Skills that we appropriate are constrained by success conditions; leading our own life depends on circumstances over which we do not have complete command.) There is, then, an interesting tension in the idea of appropriation between what is previously given and what is form- able, between taking over and creating, between the subject’s sovereignty and its dependence. The crucial relation here is that between something’s being alien and its accessibility**:** objects of appropriation are neither exclusively alien nor exclusively one’s own. As Michael Theunissen puts it, “I do not need to appropriate what is exclusively my own, and what is exclusively alien I am unable to appropriate.”14 In contrast to Marx, then, for whom appropriation is conceived of according to a model of reappropriation, the account of the dynamic of appropriation and alienation that I am proposing reconceives the very concept of appropriation. This involves rehabilitating what is alien **in the model of appropriation** and radicalizing that model in the direction of a nonessentialist conception of appropriation. Appropriation would then be a permanent process of transformation in which what is appropriated first comes to be through its appropriation, without one needing to fall back into the myth of a creatio ex nihilo. Understanding appropriation as a relation in which we are simultaneously bound to something and separated from it, and in which what is appropriated always remains both alien and our own, has important implications for the ideas of emancipation and alienation bound up with the concept of appropriation. The aspiration of a successful appropriation of self and world would be, then, to make the world one’s own without it having been already one’s own and in wanting to give structure to the world and to one’s own life without beginning from a position of already having complete command ov

### Contention 2 is Forced Labor:

#### A ban on handguns is part of a broader strategy that deconstructs private property, as it exists in the status quo, which currently alienates workers.

#### Through labor, one becomes alien to the rest of the world since your life becomes meaningless once you orient yourself towards private property. Setting up a system of property like that in the neg world entails that individuals are separated from their projects by the property they have. MARX 44 –:

Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844. Karl Marx “Estranged Labour”

All these consequences are implied in the statement that the worker is related to the product of labor as to an alien object. For on this premise it is clear that the more the worker spends himself, the more powerful becomes the alien world of objects which he [the agent] creates over and against himself, the poorer he himself – his inner world – becomes, the less belongs to him as his own. It is the same in religion. The more man puts into God, the less he retains in himself. The worker puts his life into the object; but now his [their] life no longer belongs to [the worker] him but to the object. Hence, the greater this activity, the more the worker lacks objects. Whatever the product of his labor is, he is not. Therefore, the greater this product, the less is he himself. The alienation of the worker in his [their] product means not only that his [their] labor becomes an object, an external existence, but that it exists outside [them] him, independently, as something alien to [them] him, and that it becomes a power on its own confronting him. It means that the life which he has conferred on the object confronts him as something hostile and alien. ||XXIII/ Let us now look more closely at the objectification, at the production of the worker; and in it at the estrangement, the loss of the object, of his product. The worker can create nothing without nature, without the sensuous external world. It is the material on which his labor is realized, in which it is active, from which, and by means of which it produces. But just as nature provides labor with [the] means of life in the sense that labor cannot live without objects on which to operate, on the other hand, it also provides the means of life in the more restricted sense, i.e., the means for the physical subsistence of the worker himself. Thus the more the worker by his labor appropriates the external world, sensuous nature, the more he deprives himself [themselves] of the means of life in two respects: first, in that the sensuous external world more and more ceases to be an object belonging to his labor – to be his labor’s means of life; and, second, in that it more and more ceases to be a means of life in the immediate sense, means for the physical subsistence of the worker. In both respects, therefore, the worker becomes a servant of his object, first, in that he receives an object of labor, i.e., in that he receives work, and, secondly, in that he receives means of subsistence. This enables him to exist, first as a worker; and second, as a physical subject. The height of this servitude is that it is only as a worker that he can maintain himself as a physical subject and that it is only as a physical subject that he is a worker. (According to the economic laws the estrangement of the worker in his object is expressed thus: the more the worker produces, the less he has to consume; the more values he creates, the more valueless, the more unworthy he becomes; the better formed his product, the more deformed becomes the worker; the more civilized his object, the more barbarous becomes the worker; the more powerful labor becomes, the more powerless becomes the worker; the more ingenious labor becomes, the less ingenious becomes the worker and the more he becomes nature’s slave.) Political economy conceals the estrangement inherent in the nature of labor by not considering the direct relationship between the worker (labor) and production. It is true that labor produces for the rich wonderful things – but for the worker it produces privation. It produces palaces – but for the worker, hovels. It produces beauty – but for the worker, deformity. It replaces labor by machines, but it throws one section of the workers back into barbarous types of labor and it turns the other section into a machine. It produces intelligence – but for the worker, stupidity, cretinism. The direct relationship of labor to its products is the relationship of the worker to the objects of his production. The relationship of the man of means to the objects of production and to production itself is only a consequence of this first relationship – and confirms it. We shall consider this other aspect later. When we ask, then, what is the essential relationship of labor we are asking about the relationship of the worker to production. Till now we have been considering the estrangement, the alienation of the worker only in one of its aspects , i.e., the worker’s relationship to the products of his labor. But the estrangement is manifested not only in the result but in the act of production, within the producing activity, itself. How could the worker come to face the product of his activity as a stranger, were it not that in the very act of production he was estranging himself from himself? The product is after all but the summary of the activity, of production. If then the product of labor is alienation, production itself must be active alienation, the alienation of activity, the activity of alienation. In the estrangement of the object of labor is merely summarized the estrangement, the alienation, in the activity of labor itself.

#### What distinguishes animals for humans is consciousness, the process of divorcing thought from arbitrary principles – but alienated labor reduces us to animal instincts – I control the root cause to forms of oppression since this specific form of alienation is the basis of all exclusion, social and mental.

Karl Marx 2 “Estranged Labour”Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844

Physically man lives only on these products of nature, whether they appear in the form of food, heating, clothes, a dwelling, etc. The universality of man appears in practice precisely in the universality which makes all nature his inorganic body – both inasmuch as nature is (1) his direct means of life, and (2) the material, the object, and the instrument of his life activity. Nature is man’s inorganic body – nature, that is, insofar as it is not itself human body. Man lives on nature – means that nature is his body, with which he must remain in continuous interchange if he is not to die. That man’s physical and spiritual life is linked to nature means simply that nature is linked to itself, for man is a part of nature. In estranging from man (1) nature, and (2) himself, his own active functions, his life activity, estranged labor estranges the species from man. It changes for him the life of the species into a means of individual life. First it [alienated labor] estranges the life of the species and individual life, and secondly it makes individual life in its abstract form the purpose of the life of the species, likewise in its abstract and estranged form. For labor, life activity, productive life itself, appears to man in the first place merely as a means of satisfying a need – the need to maintain physical existence. Yet the productive life is the life of the species. It is life-engendering life. The whole character of a species, its species-character, is contained in the character of its life activity; and free, conscious activity is man’s species-character. Life itself appears only as a means to life. The animal is immediately one with its life activity. It does not distinguish itself from it. It is its life activity. Man makes his life activity [with] itself the object of his will and of his consciousness. He has conscious life activity. It is not a determination with which he directly merges. Conscious life activity distinguishes man immediately from animal life activity. It is just because of this that he is a species-being. Or it is only because he is a species-being that he is a conscious being, i.e., that his own life is an object for him. Only because of that is his activity free activity. Estranged labor reverses the relationship, so that it is just because man is a conscious being that he makes his life activity, his essential being, a mere means to his existence. In creating a world of objects by his personal activity, in his work upon inorganic nature, man proves himself a conscious species-being, i.e., as a being that treats the species as his own essential being, or that treats itself as a species-being. Admittedly animals also produce. They build themselves nests, dwellings, like the bees, beavers, ants, etc. But an animal only produces what it immediately needs for itself or its young. It produces one-sidedly, whilst man produces universally. It produces only under the dominion of immediate physical need, whilst man produces even when he is free from physical need and only truly produces in freedom therefrom. An animal produces only itself, whilst man reproduces the whole of nature. An animal’s product belongs immediately to its physical body, whilst man freely confronts his product. An animal forms only in accordance with the standard and the need of the species to which it belongs, whilst man knows how to produce in accordance with the standard of every species, and knows how to apply everywhere the inherent standard to the object. Man therefore also forms objects in accordance with the laws of beauty. It is just in his work upon the objective world, therefore, that man really proves himself to be a species-being. This production is his active species-life. Through this production, nature appears as his work and his reality. The object of labor is, therefore, the objectification of man’s species-life: for he duplicates himself not only, as in consciousness, intellectually, but also actively, in reality, and therefore he sees himself in a world that he has created. In tearing away from man the object of his production, therefore, estranged labor tears from him his species-life, his real objectivity as a member of the species and transforms his advantage over animals into the disadvantage that his inorganic body, nature, is taken from him. Similarly, in degrading spontaneous, free activity to a means, estranged labor makes man’s species-life a means to his physical existence. The consciousness which man has of his species is thus transformed by estrangement in such a way that species[-life] becomes for him a means. Estranged labor turns thus: (3) Man’s species-being, both nature and his spiritual species-property, into a being alien to him, into a means of his individual existence. It estranges from man his own body, as well as external nature and his spiritual aspect, his human aspect. (4) An immediate consequence of the fact that man is estranged from the product of his labor, from his life activity, from his species-being, is the estrangement of man from man. When man confronts himself, he confronts the other man. What applies to a man’s relation to his work, to the product of his labor and to himself, also holds of a man’s relation to the other man, and to the other man’s labor and object of labor. In fact, the proposition that man’s species-nature is estranged from him means that one man is estranged from the other, as each of them is from man’s essential nature. The estrangement of man, and in fact every relationship in which man [stands] to himself, is realized and expressed only in the relationship in which a man stands to other men. Hence within the relationship of estranged labor each man views the other in accordance with the standard and the relationship in which he finds himself as a worker. ||XXV| We took our departure from a fact of political economy – the estrangement of the worker and his production. We have formulated this fact in conceptual terms as estranged, alienated labor. We have analyzed this concept – hence analyzing merely a fact of political economy. Let us now see, further, how the concept of estranged, alienated labor must express and present itself in real life. If the product of labor is alien to me, if it confronts me as an alien power, to whom, then, does it belong? To a being other than myself. Who is this being? The gods? To be sure, in the earliest times the principal production (for example, the building of temples, etc., in Egypt, India and Mexico) appears to be in the service of the gods, and the product belongs to the gods. However, the gods on their own were never the lords of labor. No more was nature. And what a contradiction it would be if, the more man subjugated nature by his labor and the more the miracles of the gods were rendered superfluous by the miracles of industry, the more man were to renounce the joy of production and the enjoyment of the product to please these powers. The alien being, to whom labor and the product of labor belongs, in whose service labor is done and for whose benefit the product of labor is provided, can only be man himself. If the product of labor does not belong to the worker, if it confronts him as an alien power, then this can only be because it belongs to some other man than the worker. If the worker’s activity is a torment to him, to another it must give satisfaction and pleasure. Not the gods, not nature, but only man himself can be this alien power over man. We must bear in mind the previous proposition that man’s relation to himself becomes for him objective and actual through his relation to the other man. Thus, if the product of his labor, his labor objectified, is for him an alien, hostile, powerful object independent of him, then his position towards it is such that someone else is master of this object, someone who is alien, hostile, powerful, and independent of him. If he treats his own activity as an unfree activity, then he treats it as an activity performed in the service, under the dominion, the coercion, and the yoke of another man. Every self-estrangement of man, from himself and from nature, appears in the relation in which he places himself and nature to men other than and differentiated from himself. For this reason religious self-estrangement necessarily appears in the relationship of the layman to the priest, or again to a mediator, etc., since we are here dealing with the intellectual world. In the real practical world self-estrangement can only become manifest through the real practical relationship to other men. The medium through which estrangement takes place is itself practical. Thus through estranged labor man not only creates his relationship to the object and to the act of production as to powers [in the manuscript Menschen (men) instead of Mächte (powers). – Ed.] that are alien and hostile to him; he also creates the relationship in which other men stand to his production and to his product, and the relationship in which he stands to these other men. Just as he creates his own production as the loss of his reality, as his punishment; his own product as a loss, as a product not belonging to him; so he creates the domination of the person who does not produce over production and over the product. Just as he estranges his own activity from himself, so he confers upon the stranger an activity which is not his own. We have until now considered this relationship only from the standpoint of the worker and later on we shall be considering it also from the standpoint of the non-worker. Through estranged, alienated labor, then, the worker produces the relationship to this labor of a man alien to labor and standing outside it. The relationship of the worker to labor creates the relation to it of the capitalist (or whatever one chooses to call the master of labor). Private property is thus the product, the result, the necessary consequence, of alienated labor, of the external relation of the worker to nature and to himself. Private property thus results by analysis from the concept of alienated labor, i.e., of alienated man, of estranged labor, of estranged life, of estranged man. True, it is as a result of the movement of private property that we have obtained the concept of alienated labor (of alienated life) in political economy. But on analysis of this concept it becomes clear that though private property appears to be the reason, the cause of alienated labor, it is rather its consequence, just as the gods are originally not the cause but the effect of man’s intellectual confusion. Later this relationship becomes reciprocal.

#### This outweighs – having everything around one non-alienated doesn’t solve alienation, but rather, one must be able to identify with the alien events that happen around the self. You can be denied certain ends, but you can’t be denied the ability to pursue ends at all.

Rahel Jaeggi 7 (August 2014). “Alienation.” Columbia University Press. Translated by Frederick Neuhouser and Alan E. Smith. Edited by Frederick Neuhouser. Rahel Jaeggi is professor of social and political philosophy at the Humboldt University in Berlin. Her research focuses on ethics, social philosophy, political philosophy, philosophical anthropology, social ontology, and critical theory.

There must be, then, a distinction between alienating and nonalienating situations where one has lost control or where the results of our actions take on an independent existence in relation to us. This distinction can be located [on whether], on the one hand, in one’s later attitude to the events in question: one can reject or accept them; one can identify (or not) after the fact with events that had a dynamic of their own. On the other hand, we can also locate the distinction in different ways of participating in events that have taken on an independent existence. The idea of a self’s being “present” (or “present to itself”) at least hints at the relevant point here: there can be degrees of identification with events for which the self is not entirely responsible that depend not on the amount of control one has over them but on the greater or lesser extent to which one is present in them.22 (One is then “taken in” by the situation, absorbed in it; one forgets oneself in it, in contrast to the distance that characterizes the young man of our example.) According to this analysis, then, not every case in which the results of actions have taken on an independent existence and not every uncontrollable dynamic of life events is alienating per se. We have seen that the question of whether a life takes on an independent existence in an alienating manner is not decided by whether it is in every respect self-structured, controlled, or predictable but rather on whether the part of it that is outside one’s command can be appropriated in a certain way. The theme of appropriation here (as set out in chapter 1) is supposed to bring out the point that having something at one’s command, “putting oneself in relation to something,” or being able to identify with something does not depend on understanding that something as—in Marx’s sense—the product of one’s own activity. Rather, it is a question of whether or not one can appropriate the events that determine our lives, especially when they are not steered or controlled by us, where they are not “placed into the world” by us. The process of externalization and reappropriation at issue here is perhaps best thought of as a process of “balancing out”: every decision, every action sets processes in motion or produces results that may at first be alien and can be made our own only by (re)appropriating them. What is one’s own, then, is not necessarily something one has produced or directed oneself; the result of an act of appropriation does not consist only of something that was previously one’s own. Having an appropriating relation to the (uncontrollable) events of one’s own life means that one must be able to bring oneself into an affirmative relation to what is alien or uncontrollable. Alienation is not the foreignness (or the becoming foreign) per se of the results of actions but rather an interruption or disturbance of the process in which actions produce (uncontrollable) results to which one then establishes a relation of reappropriation. The concept of appropriation is well-suited for illustrating the practical character of this process. Appropriation is not a matter of making a choice from a disengaged or objective standpoint, nor is it a matter of merely rejecting or agreeing to the result of an action. What I have called balancing out does not depend on weighing things from an external perspective; it is a process in which one is involved. The process of appropriation is not made up only of cognitive elements, and it is not subject only to the will. Not every- thing one might like to be can actually be made one’s own. Appropriation is a process of learning and experience in which the relation between freedom and uncontrollability is negotiated. Conversely, alienation is a halting of this process.

er them.